DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 700 HE 008 979

AUTHOR Sikes, Walter; Barrett, Laurence
TITLE Case Studies on Faculty Development.
INSTITUTION Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 64p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Suite 320, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; *Case Studies; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; College Administration; *Development; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Research; *Faculty; *Faculty Development; *Higher Education; *Individual Development; Professional Education; Professional Services; Program Development

ABSTRACT

The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) conducted this study of the funding and implementation of a faculty development program starting in 1973. In each of the four case studies, selected from 40 participating colleges, a team of faculty members was created as a mechanism to improve faculty development efforts. A team of three was chosen by the academic dean in conjunction with a faculty advisory group. After a preliminary one-week workshop, which included the deans and presidents, the teams were expanded to nine faculty. Regional workshops were held to help generate creative activity on the campuses. The four colleges for these case studies provide a diversity in geographic setting, religious orientation, clientele, and history of previous involvement with faculty development. A conceptual framework is provided to view the faculty development efforts of these four campuses. The model presents four types of methods for intervening in an organization, and three distinct levels at which these techniques may be brought to bear. The resultant 12 categories help to order the heterogeneous activities on the campuses, and when considered in relation to the basic profile of each college, the categories help to explain why each institution selected the strategy that it did. Factors hindering the success of the teams and factors conducive to success of faculty development teams are discussed and a list is provided of effective activities sponsored by the teams. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

CASE STUDIES ON faculty development

by Walter Sikes and Laurence Barrett

November, 1976

ED140700

HE008979

Gary H. Quehl, General Editor

2 Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges

CASE STUDIES ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

by

Walter Sikes and Laurence Barrett

November, 1976

Gary H. Quehl, General Editor

Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Suite 320, One Dupont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

PREFACE

The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) has often followed the practice of concentrating its energies and resources on one problem at a time. Selecting areas of concern to its member colleges, CASC has focused successively on curriculum development, financial management, the responsibilities of trustees, administrative planning and procedures, student affairs, long range planning, and information systems. Such a strategy has made the best expertise in the country available to a large number of colleges and encouraged support from outside funding sources.

In the Spring of 1973, in accordance with a recommendation from the Academic Commission (a committee of five, most of whom are academic officers in member colleges), the board of directors requested CASC's executive officers to undertake the study, funding and implementation of a faculty development program.

Initially, external consultants were brought in to join the CASC staff in a task force designed to set initial objectives of the program. It was hoped that the project would improve the professional development opportunities of individual faculty members on each campus, enhance their collective effectiveness as teachers, advisors and scholars, and consequently increase learning opportunities for the students with whom they work. Since faculty development must be a continuing activity, not limited to the life of the CASC program, the task force emphasized the need to establish on each campus a climate of faculty-administration interaction, and to encourage reward systems and growth incentives which would ensure the continuance of professional growth for faculty in the participating colleges. Finally, it was hoped that those participating colleges could provide for other institutions a viable model that could be adopted and adapted to their

own resources and needs.

Implementing this program required a planning committee and funding. The planning committee was comprised of select academic officers from member colleges, external consultants, and Council staff. Funding was provided by the Exxon Foundation, the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation and, chiefly, the Lilly Endowment.

The planning committee accepted as premises three assumptions derived from the literature of change theory: (1) lasting change cannot be imposed from the top; (2) the greater the investment of faculty time and energy in designing and implementing a program of faculty development, the greater will be the chance of success; and (3) commitment of trustees, administrators and faculty is essential for effective change.

The first activity of the program was to recruit 40 participating colleges. Each college was asked to indicate its willingness to: commit the president, academic dean, and three faculty members for a week-long training workshop; build a nine member faculty team; commit its faculty to serious consideration of professional development for one year; ensure that the administration would make a reasonable effort to support the faculty team; and indicate an intent to invest increasing resources to faculty development over the next five years. Forty colleges were selected to participate in the program. This report summarizes and analyzes the efforts of four of these colleges.

Many persons contributed to the CASC project and to the preparation of this report. Those who were most critically involved were: Harold Hodgkinson and Richard Meeth who provided much of the design and were principal consultants; Roger Voskuyl and Gordon Workema who were the key CASC staff members when the project began; Gary Quehl and Gerrit TenBrink

who continued Voskuyl and Workema's work; and Jack Lindquist and Bill Bergquist who developed many of the concepts in the program. Special thanks is also given to Jennifer Grimes Bergquist for her assistance in preparing the manuscript. Finally, we are indebted to the persons on the campuses, especially to the team members, who were gracious and helpful.

Walter Sikes, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Laurence Barrett, Kalamazoo, Michigan

November, 1976

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
Creating the Teams	3
The National Institute	6
Campus Activities and Regional Workshops	6
Collecting the Data	7
THE FOUR COLLEGES	9
College A	9
College B	12
College C	15
College D	19
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES	23
Techniques	23
Levels of Entry	25
Process Facilitation -- Personal	27
Process Facilitation -- Multipersonal	32
Process Facilitation -- Institutional	33
Structural Technical -- Personal	35
Structural Technical -- Interpersonal	36
Structural Technical -- Institutional	37
Knowledge and Expertise -- Personal	38
Knowledge and Expertise -- Multipersonal	40
Knowledge and Expertise -- Institutional	41
Research and Demonstration -- Personal	42
Research and Demonstration -- Interpersonal	43
Research and Demonstration -- Institutional	44
HINDRANCES AND ASSETS	45
Hindrances to Team Progress	45
Factors Conducive to Success	49
CONCLUSION	56
Effective Activities Sponsored by Teams	56

INTRODUCTION

Academic people have developed a healthy distrust of amorphous terms. Unfortunately, "faculty development" is not a term which yields to neat Aristotelian definition, for it describes a diversity of activities in higher education. The ultimate goal of faculty development is to make the profession of college teaching more successful and more satisfying. Whether activities focus on organizational patterns and procedures, interpersonal relationships, instructional techniques, or personal competence, all attempt to enhance the craft of the individual teacher.

Travel money for faculty attending professional meetings, released time or typists fees for people finishing dissertations, sabbaticals, student evaluations, retreats for faculty, and encouragement to publish (that sometimes looked like pressure) have long been standard practices in many institutions. If faculty development seems new -- and the apprehensive condemn it as the current academic fad -- it is because new and effective techniques have been added to these traditional standbys. Workshops to develop courses and methods, counseling services for faculty, new and more reliable feedback techniques for self-evaluation, improvements in decision-making, and a number of other relatively fresh ways of coming at old problems are, indeed, worthwhile extensions of faculty development but they are hardly revolutionary. What has been, until recently, an unsystematic pattern of one-shot activities on most campuses, is becoming a coordinated program integrating both old and new activities. Finally, faculty development is drawing attention simply because many administrations are beginning to take it seriously.

Administrators who must assign resources in colleges are not supporting faculty development programs because of awakened humanitarianism or a new

concern for their faculty as individuals. The shift in many institutions from an expanding to a declining or at best a steady-state economy has made improvement of current faculty a chief concern. The tightening economy has reinforced the assumption -- probably correct though never proven -- that institutional survival depends on effectiveness. Many people have assumed -- again, probably correctly -- that effectiveness depends on faculty. Hence, faculty development achieves a new importance.

Teachers often view faculty development programs as devices used by the administration to "get more out of us." This viewpoint is made the more credible by the common misuse of some techniques which are unquestionably helpful when wisely employed in the professional growth of individual teachers. For instance, precise feedback from students as to what factors in the learning milieu were valuable to them is valuable data for the teacher. Yet student evaluations are often misused by administrators to justify decisions better made using other criteria. Similarly, efficiency studies of curricula, which can demonstrate how to reassign whole blocks of time for more effective teaching, are also used by administrators to make changes which faculty view as dysfunctional for their work and students' learning.

The primary goal of faculty development is not efficiency, but effectiveness, which is at the root of the personal self-respect of the individual teacher. Effectiveness and efficiency are not always incompatible, but since they may be, the over-involvement of the efficiency-minded can be inhibiting to faculty development. In many institutions, the administration has made the wise decision to back faculty development, but to leave the planning and implementation to teams of teaching faculty.

The term "faculty development" refers to a wide range of activities that can be categorized as personal development, institutional improvement,

or organizational improvement. Since each activity is appropriate in only some circumstances, each institution must identify the most urgent needs of its own faculty and students and then determine what kinds of activities can be realistically accomplished within the limits of available resources. It is not necessary that the list be complete or the definition be accepted universally before the program is implemented. A high level of agreement is desirable, of course, because it is then easier to establish priorities.

We intend to present here some insights about how four quite different colleges addressed the problem of faculty development. We will describe the various activities tried at the different institutions, and offer some tentative estimates of how effective each of these techniques proved to be.

Creating the Teams

In accord with CASC's strategy, the core of this project was the use of faculty teams as a mechanism to improve faculty development efforts. The teams were created in the following way. After the participating colleges were selected, each academic dean, in conjunction with a faculty advisory group, selected a faculty team of three persons. The three faculty members were identified as individuals who were respected by their colleagues, and who demonstrated a concern for growth and development, and a willingness to help institute a program of professional growth for their own colleges. After a preliminary one-week workshop, which included the deans and presidents, the teams were expanded to nine faculty.

Traditionally, faculty development in most small colleges has been the responsibility of the academic dean and the president. In many colleges it has been the dean's office to which the faculty member applied for travel

money, leave or other support. In some church related colleges, the president's role has been pastoral as well as administrative.

The decision to use faculty teams to plan and implement professional development on the campuses was made in the conviction that no other structure would be as effective in spite of (or perhaps because of) these traditions. Faculty teams are much more likely to be concerned with effectiveness than with efficiency. Admittedly, efficiency is essential in these times, but any competent administration can be expected to keep a faculty reminded of this concern. A healthy procedure for faculty teams seems to be to work for effectiveness as the chief objective and then to work within the constraints of limited resources.

Faculty will feel a sense of ownership over something they have created themselves; this attitude increases the likelihood of success. Even well intentioned changes imposed from above can be viewed as threatening. Faculty are likely to know their own needs and they become constructively involved in programs created by themselves or their colleagues.

Alternatives to faculty teams were considered by CASC. One alternative to building teams is to assign the responsibility of the program to already existing faculty groups such as the Academic Policies Committee, the Committee on Sabbaticals, or the Faculty Welfare Committee. However, members have usually been assigned to established committees with certain traditional objectives in mind, and if the charge of the committee is radically changed, members are likely to respond in an uncongenial manner. Regardless of the talents and interests of the members, an established committee tends to operate within accepted expectations, and no new charge is likely to erase the vague sense, in the committee and outside it, that it is acting out of order in taking on a new responsibility. Then too, faculty development is too important to be simply an additional responsibility

for anyone. Whoever undertakes it should consider it his or her chief responsibility.

In planning a faculty development program, a tempting alternative is to select a respected member of the faculty to take charge of the program rather than trying to create a team. This approach promises to save time, particularly if the person is decisive and forceful; this method also allows a dean to put faculty in charge of professional development while the administrator maintains a strong control of the program.

Although groups have their shortcomings and difficulties, they have a number of advantages over individual change agents. Groups are more likely than an individual to analyze a problem from a variety of perspectives, and then to suggest a number of alternative ways of responding to it. Groups tend to be self correcting, partly because they have a data base which is the sum of the experience and knowledge of all the members, and partly because ideas must be worked through by a number of people. If committees consume more time, and they usually do, it must be remembered that the goal is not quick decisions, but rather commitment and sound plans. A varied group of faculty members, as opposed to any one person, will muster more commitment from their colleagues. Successful groups help to maintain energy, interest, and courage of those who are trying to bring about change.

Finally, again and again faculty development team members have proven to be not just the changers but the changed. On campus after campus, members of teams have found valuable support in each other. They have felt themselves learning and growing professionally as they pursued the job of helping others to do so. A common comment from members of these teams is: "We need to find a way to give this kind of experience (of the group) to all faculty." Experience, then, argues for the use of a faculty

committee charged specifically with professional growth and development on the campus as a major component of a development strategy.

The National Institute

After the 40 CASC colleges had been selected from the 140 members, the teams gathered at Oklahoma Christian College in August, 1974, for a week of preparatory work. Each college sent three faculty members, its president, and its academic dean. Workshop activities included large lectures, small group discussions, and planning meetings for the individual teams. Each team had previously submitted a preliminary design for a faculty development program appropriate to its own campus. An opportunity was provided for each team to: refine these plans, gather information, discuss alternative approaches to faculty development, and meet with external consultants. Most of the teams went home with clear-cut objectives, plans for achieving these goals, and a high level of motivation.

Campus Activities and Regional Workshops

After returning to their campuses, the teams added six more faculty members, making a total of nine committee members. In accord with the project design, most colleges presidents and deans assumed a supportive role. A series of regional workshops were held during the Fall in order to help every team acquire new knowledge and skills in the team building process, to help solve problems encountered to date, and to maintain incentive. Each workshop was attended by teams from four to six colleges. Staff for these workshops included three of the consultants who had worked with the colleges in August. Response to the regional workshops was generally very positive. There is no question that they were an important element in

helping to generate creative activity on the campuses.

Collecting the Data

During the Spring of 1975, the authors visited four of the institutions which had been participating in the CASC program since the Summer of 1974. The visits were made at the request of CASC, and the authors were directed to find out how the faculty development programs were progressing. The four colleges were deliberately chosen to provide a diversity in geographic setting, religious orientation, clientele, and history of previous involvement with faculty development.

While this report should provide valuable information and suggestions to other institutions interested in initiating faculty development programs, it is not a handbook of faculty development or a systematic evaluation. Barrett and Sikes each visited each campus for three days. They collected and reviewed all available data about each college and its faculty development program before the visit. The authors interviewed on each campus 30 or more faculty, administrators, and students, individually and in groups of two or three. They made an effort to spend time with people who represented a wide range of opinions and feelings about faculty development. Each member of the faculty development team was interviewed individually, and Barrett and Sikes also met with the entire team for a final exit interview. The interviews were unstructured and open, and the two interviewers worked independently, meeting frequently to share findings and impressions, and to plan for further interviews. Nevertheless, the data are quite limited when considered in the light of the totality of the institution.

Only tentative conclusions are possible regarding the faculty development programs on each of these campuses since the programs were in the planning stages, just initiated, or in progress for less than a year. Since faculty development is a continuous process, however, any descriptive comments or judgments about a program must be tentative.

Because the study was designed to report successful and unsuccessful efforts alike, the four colleges were promised anonymity. A sense of the distinctive qualities of the institutions is necessary, however, since each selected techniques suited to its style, its history, its resources, and the specific needs of the faculty. The brief sketches that follow clearly indicate how important it is that the strategies used by an institution be appropriate to its milieu.

College A

The buildings on the campus of College A tend to be solid and slightly austere, reflecting a sense of tradition that goes back to the 1880's, when the academy from which it evolved admitted the first students. In the center of the campus, however, an imaginatively designed modern classroom building reflects another aspect of the college. The classrooms of this building radiate around a central hall to wide glass walls, leaving the rooms visually open to the tulip trees outside and to the entire campus. People passing or studying under the trees look in at the classes without embarrassment, and students and faculty look out at them, apparently without distraction.

In the president's office, an architect's drawing of a planned building, boldly contemporary in design, reflects the college's willingness to accept change as a part of life -- perhaps too unquestioningly. Though the welcoming openness of the classroom building is absent, the design of the projected physical education building is courageous; its size reflects confidence in the support of friends outside the college and faith in the church that the college represents.

College A is clearly an evangelical Christian college. Most of the students are preparing for lives in education, Christian education or other church work, social services, or business. Some students go on for MA degrees or specialized graduate work, though few continue for their PhD's. College enrollment is between four and five hundred, and the institution simply cannot afford the spectrum of courses required to make it a prep school for the university graduate schools.

Many of the students attending this institution are first generation college students. They come from families strong in Christian belief, and the students want an education in an environment which encourages devotional living and reflects the importance of moral and ethical action. They are drawn to the college by the unreservedly Christian atmosphere, are happy in it and contribute to it although there are, of course, a few students who express discontent and frustration (many of these, we were told, are here at the behest of their parents).

A concern of both students and faculty is whether the campus milieu is perhaps too warm, too honest, too protected to provide an adequate preparation for a cold, dishonest and often immoral world. In spite of being frequently expressed, this problem seems to be more academic than pragmatic, perhaps because students are not now cloistered on the campus, but experience much through field work; graduates go into the world without suffering culture shock.

Although avowedly Christian, this college is neither pietistic nor prescriptive. Faculty are genuinely concerned for students. They set high standards for them and for themselves, and they do not think of their responsibility as limited to the classroom or to their academic discipline. Similarly, faculty feel for each other little competetiveness

and much mutual responsibility, and the division between administration and teaching staff is much less than characterises so many colleges. Although the faculty express some apprehension about cost accounting in the academic dean's office, they generally trust the president and the dean who are, for their part, supportive of faculty.

The president is making a sincere attempt to improve management procedures, to earn a new respect for the college (particularly in the local community which formally thought it provincial and second-rate), to upgrade admissions, to make the college community even more cohesive, and to increase operating efficiency. These are complex tasks, but the president inspires confidence, and the college is scoring victories in several of these areas. The successes encourage a faith in the future which, along with the traditions of the college, are conducive to faculty development.

The direction taken by the faculty development team is entirely appropriate to this college community. The team calls itself the Professional Growth Committee (PGC) and seeks to implement personal growth plans through the mutual support of colleagues. The PGC is one of 10 standing committees and has a regular membership of six teaching faculty. Several faculty and administrators suggested that the directions taken by and the success of the PGC have been strongly influenced by the CASC program. A key faculty member remarked that he did not think the program would have gotten underway without CASC initiative and support, and other individuals frequently mentioned CASC sponsored workships as critical events. The Oklahoma workshop clearly gave the team a chance to discover a variety of approaches to faculty development, and the Fall visit by a CASC resource person provided stimulation to the campus program. A CASC Fall workshop with teams from other schools was a high point in the year for team members.

They particularly enjoyed the chance to spend an extended period of "high quality" time with each other which solidified their group.

The PGC enjoys a fine environment in which to work. The administration is supportive, and faculty frequently spoke with appreciation for the dean's efforts to keep faculty informed about opportunities for professional development outside the college. This is an important service since this college is geographically isolated and has, in the past, tended to be somewhat parochial. Faculty are concerned for each other and tolerant of idiosyncrasies. Students are open and friendly in their communication with faculty, and faculty see their chief objective as encouraging the personal and academic growth of their students.

College B

College B was established in the 1880's as a novitiate normal school which served a Roman Catholic sisterhood. The college is still forthrightly Catholic, but it has moved beyond the uneasy and painful steps which so often characterize the transition from an institution for novitiates to a college serving the lay public: the token status of laymen on the board of trustees, the (usually unacknowledged) division between lay faculty and sisters, the decisions made in the mother house after the committee meetings.

The college has been forced to move aggressively quite simply because it is financially pressed. The campus, which was once a suburban estate, draws some of its 1,000 students from out of state. However, the institution's chief strength has always been the service it rendered the local midwestern urban area. In the 1960's, a new, heavily funded tax supported college was established in expansive open country just 10 miles

to the west. In response to this competition, College B has undertaken an urban community development project which also provides a learning experience for its students. The project offers three continuing education options: night classes which may lead to a degree for people holding down full time jobs; a program for women who want to resume their education; and a continual degree program. This college has demonstrated an enviable know-how in grantsmanship, and faculty development efforts had been funded prior to the CASC program. In 1969, an institutional self-study, initiated by the new president stressed the importance of faculty development and recommended action. The president responded to the recommendation, and the college became a leader in attracting foundation funds for a series of statewide workshops -- to the chagrin of several more prestigious and complacent private colleges in the state.

These workshops began in 1971 and concentrated on improving teaching and faculty. College B assumed leadership for implementing these workshops, and for attracting support for this program from the participating colleges. When the foundation which had sponsored the workshops gave the college a grant for the community service project, additional funds were included for faculty development. In 1974, CASC invited the college to participate in its faculty development program. By this time, the college had already supported a faculty development office for two years; it had raised money for the professional growth of its faculty; many of its faculty had attended and profited from workshops run under the statewide program; and the faculty were familiar with the concept of faculty development.

When a Faculty Development Committee was organized under the CASC program, the director of the Faculty Development Program became its chairperson. The director is lively, effective, and well-respected. The program tends to be seen as hers, which reduces the sense of ownership and

commitment felt by others. The other 11 members of the Committee did not necessarily have much initial interest in faculty development per se, although all had strongly related interests. Several members had been involved and active in a community development project, and during the early life of the Committee, there was some division between these individuals and those who were not involved in that project. This source of conflict was faced by the team and dealt with during a CASC regional workshop in the Fall. Since that time, the group has been close knit and mutually supportive.

College B has a history of creative development and strong faculty leadership. If there are constraints or inhibiting factors, it is not because novelty presents a threat, but because of faculty and administrative concern for maintaining a cohesive college community in the face of some adverse conditions.

College B reflects many of the problems and contradictions inherent in an urban institution. Most of the students commute, although dorms can house about 40 percent of the student body. There are a 1,000 undergraduates plus some 800 students enrolled in continuing education -- far too many for anyone to know everyone's name. There are really two distinct student populations; regular undergraduates are not knowledgeable about the programs that characterize the night classes. Most of the faculty commute, and some are part time. The continuing education programs are diverse, and the differences between them seem to reflect who is administering them rather than principle or policy. The college is running hard to stay ahead of the tax-supported state institution 10 miles to the west. Good grantsmanship helps, but grantsmanship takes time -- time to conceive plans, to write proposals and reports, and to play host to visiting consultants and examiners. Under these pressures and the conditions listed

above, faculty relationships with students outside of class and the basic human business of communicating with colleagues are often neglected. Faculty assemblies, instead of being experiences that draw everyone together, are dominated by a few actively negative voices; they frustrate almost everyone else. These factors make it difficult to build and to maintain a sense of community.

An inhibiting factor at this college is a pattern of independent action. Talented and committed faculty tend to isolate themselves from each other and to work independently and are often quite unaware of what others are doing. Faculty development at this institution, prior to the CASC program, had been primarily the achievement and responsibility of one person. When CASC inspired the creation of a team, this person naturally became its chairperson, and there remains some question about the overall effects of her dominance in spite of her clear strengths. When a foundation added faculty development money to the community development grant, tension developed over who would control that fund.

The college is aware of this lack of cohesiveness and is puzzled by it. The members of the Faculty Development Team talk about it frankly, and much of their strategy has been aimed at improving communication, unity and cooperation. They are encouraged by their considerably improved ability to communicate within the team.

College C

The environment at College C is encouraging to growth and is conducive to change. Older members of the faculty recall that not more than 15 years ago prayer veils were still common on the campus, the dress was staid, and the men did not wear neckties. (A necktie was a sure sign that the wearer was not one of the Christian Apostles, but someone from the world.)

Many faculty members also remember when the music building, a few frame structures, and Old Main were the only buildings on the campus. Some recall the days when the institution was a Bible college and by far the greater part of the student body were members of the supporting church.

Now, students wear blue jeans and faculty wear neckties, like students and faculty in any small college. On this campus, almost everyone smiles and warmly greets everyone else, old friends and strangers alike. Since the early 1960's, as the enrollment steadily rose to its present level of about 1,000, new buildings have appeared on campus: new dormitories, a church and center for religious education, a science and classroom building, and a fine new student center and gymnasium. The new buildings are conservatively functional, and they are scattered around the wide, rolling grounds. The buildings do not crowd each other; indeed, the entire campus suggests openness and freedom. Although few students come to this college without sharing its strongly held Christian commitment, only about 20 percent are members of the affiliated church.

The changes at this college have occurred naturallly and steadily. They have not been cataclysmic or wrenching. The growth in enrollment has necessitated additions to the faculty, and the teaching staff includes a sizeable number of relatively young people, talented and creative, who are anxious to see the college strengthened. The president, the dean, and the business manager have broadened the base of financial support, adding gifts from industry, private donors, and foundations to those from the church. The dean has made heavy use of consultants, and has turned the attention of the faculty to what is happening in the academic world, with the result that the college community was fully aware of faculty development by 1974, and anxious to participate in the CASC program.

The Growth and Development Team at this college was established as a subgroup under a task force which had been organized in 1972 as a result of the college's participation in a national campus change project. The Growth and Development Team was expected to work at faculty development while the Change Task Force was to concern itself primarily with introducing greater flexibility into the curriculum. Since the groups overlap, faculty generally do not make much distinction as to which group is responsible for what.

The Growth and Development Team consisted of nine volunteer faculty members. At the August workshop, the team of three faculty and two administrators decided that they would work toward the following goals: (1) to develop activities which facilitate a sense of community and, in turn, foster individual and spiritual growth; (2) to develop a plan which recognizes 'life stages'; (3) to encourage individual initiative, planning, and participation; (4) to review the reward systems, making them responsive to individual growth and attainment; and (5) to develop plans for assisting the revised governance structure in fostering faculty growth and development.

The initial team presented these objectives to the faculty as a whole at the September retreat. The three faculty were then joined by six others to make a nine member Growth and Development Team. The team is organized into three subcommittees: Interpersonal-Social-Emotional-Spiritual, Instructional Concerns, and Personal and Professional Development. Three members of the Growth and Development Team serve on each subcommittee together with a few other faculty volunteers. Because of the college's involvement in the past few years with a number of change-oriented programs, much of what the committee has accomplished has been an extension or enrichment of innovations already underway or contemplated. This

'piggy backing' has greatly increased the impact of the team. It has also made it heir to negative feelings and resistance on the part of faculty who do not like the previous change efforts or who are apprehensive about the pace at which change is occurring.

College C has a strong sense of community which is conducive to faculty development efforts. Most members of the faculty and staff live close to the college and there is little long-distance commuting. Faculty are on campus all day and they concentrate their energy on teaching and committee work. Faculty and students know each other, meet and talk in the halls, and very casually sit down at the same tables in the cafeteria.

College C is a compelling example of the importance of faculty leadership. Administrators have left the leadership of the program in the hands of faculty, without removing faculty from the teaching staff and converting them into quasi-administrators. The chairperson of the Growth and Development Team has a high energy level, the integrity that makes her a trusted leader, and a sense of organization that makes her effective in implementing plans and proposals. She delegates authority so well and gives visibility to her colleagues so generously, that it is not apparent, at first glance, how important she is to the program.

Still, College C is no utopia. Because the college is a close community, the departmentalization and unilateral responsibility taken for granted in larger institutions would be almost intolerable. Quite unlike College B, everyone here wants to know what is going on, to participate, and to be involved. This attitude may encourage unity, but it is hardly efficient, and when it breaks down it hurts. Unfortunately, tension exists between the faculty and administration. Faculty seem to want the kind of relationship with administrators which is characterized by open,

frank communication and accessibility to each other; the kind of relationships many faculty here have with their students. The president is away from the campus much of the time, and when he is present he is not accessible to faculty. Although the faculty feel more closely related to the academic dean, he is also an ambassador to the outside world and is often away. Faculty feel isolated from and uncomfortable with the administration, and they talk frankly about these feelings. This sense of estrangement is a perplexing problem since the president and dean have given strong support to the faculty development programs. Perhaps the administration's style makes the faculty uneasy not so much for pragmatic reason but, more subtly, because it is felt as a counterstatement to a faculty feeling of need.

College D

Like College B, College D was established as an institution for novitiates to an order of Roman Catholic sisters, but it has generated a different history, and the contrast between the two colleges is marked. Whereas College B is really an urban institution, College D is set on a wide campus in the wealthy outer suburbs of a large eastern city. There are many potential donors within a 10 mile radius of the campus, but College D has not developed a strong program of grantsmanship. The chief items on the income side of the budget are student fees and contributed services of the sisters.

College D has not shifted the emphasis of its mission to that of a college serving the general public. To the traditional liberal arts program, the institution has added programs in education, business, and nursing. Although about 70 members of the faculty (of more than 100) are lay people, the chairpersons of all divisions are sisters. The

students are no longer novitiates but young men and women preparing for careers in business, nursing or teaching; however, all members of the Admissions Committee at the time of the interviews were sisters. With the exception of the business manager, all members of the budget committee were sisters. With the exception of three students, all members of the College Council were sisters. And in spite of the fact that lay faculty face insecurities and responsibilities quite different from those faced by members of the cloth, the Faculty Development Committee as originally constituted under the CASC program consisted of five sisters, one layperson, and one representative from each of the six divisions, four of whom were sisters. It should be added that this committee was elected, but the distribution of membership is still significant. Originally the chairperson of the committee was a sister, but a member of the lay faculty has since replaced her.

Everyone at College D, religious and lay alike, is aware of the problem of underinvolvement of lay faculty. The sisters maintain that because lay faculty have homes, family responsibilities and other demands on their time, they (the sisters) are more free to carry out routine and manage committee work. Some sisters, however, seem to feel that they are doing more than their share of the chores, and that lay faculty are not really pulling their weight. Lay faculty, on the other hand often feel frozen out. They feel they are expected to teach but that it would be considered presumptuous for them to try to do more. Some lay faculty admit that they really do have other responsibilities and tell themselves that it is perhaps just as well they are not tied to committee work.

These differences in life style provide clues to the genesis of tension, for this is obviously not a deliberately calculated state of affairs. All but a half dozen lay faculty are women, many of them married and with

families. Half of the lay faculty is part time. For most lay faculty, it is not the accepted and expected pattern that they arrive on campus at 8:00 AM and spend all day at the institution -- which is the sisters' pattern. On closer examination, then, the two factions on campus are not simply sisters and lay people; there are those for whom the college is the chief and only commitment, and those for whom the college is only one of a number of demands upon their energies and time. These two groups do not exactly coincide with the religious and lay group, but they coincide enough to lead to the impression that the college is divided between those who are members of the cloth and those who are not. That rather pervasive feeling influences the way people talk at College D, and it makes communication more difficult. It leads lay faculty to feel they are not expected to do much more than teach their classes, and it leads to assigning responsibilities to sisters, whether or not they are committed to the particular project.

Since this problem was not generated by policy, it probably cannot be resolved by policy. The problem has resulted from the practice, due to a shortage of funds, of staffing classes with part-time women living in the proximity of the campus. The problem may be remedied only when more and more of the lay faculty are full-time women and men, hired in the national market and brought to the college to join the staff. (One of the common acts of professional commitment of traditional faculty is that they have left another institution and moved home and family to throw in their lot and their professional lives with the college they have joined.)

This division between the religious and lay groups has a direct bearing on the progress of faculty development. Several people commented that there had been no serious consideration of faculty development before the CASC program generated thinking and discussion on the matter. The most effective actions for faculty development at this institution were activities

that brought people together in other than their usual roles. The program got off to a slow start, perhaps in part because few faculty view teaching as the chief commitment of their lives and also because of a lack of a history of such activities.

At the August workshop in Oklahoma, the Faculty Development Committee decided that its primary emphasis for the year would be to increase interest and involvement in faculty development, to build momentum by kindling a desire for self improvement on the part of faculty, and to relate faculty development to student learning. The committee consisted of nine elected faculty representing all of the divisions in the college. It served its first year on an ad hoc basis, and then became a standing committee. The administration was supportive but not actively involved, apparently because administrators here, unlike those in many CASC colleges, interpreted CASC policy more rigidly as excluding them from an active role.

The committee divided its years' work into four categories: research, providing consultants, planning workshops, and providing information and materials instructive to faculty. The first of these categories consumed a good deal of time and was not as fruitful as had been hoped. The second, providing consultants, was more successful. One workshop was extremely popular with most participants, and was the highlight of the year. The information and reading materials were not used by most faculty.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

In order to provide a conceptual framework within which to view the faculty development efforts of these four campuses, Sikes developed a model of alternative approaches trying to change institutions. The model presents four types of methods for intervening in an organization, and three distinct levels at which these techniques may be brought to bear. The styles or techniques are distinguished chiefly by the kind of action taken. The levels are distinguished by whom the action affects. Coordinated with each other, the four styles and three levels yield a matrix offering 12 major categories of action. These categories help to order the heterogeneous activities on the campuses, and when considered in relation to the basic profile of each college, the categories help to explain why each institution selected the strategy that it did.

Techniques

The least complex of the techniques (although it requires considerable skill) is Process Facilitation. Efforts focused on helping people, groups, or the institution to improve skills in self-diagnosis, goal setting, and problem solving fall in this category. This technique proceeds on the basis of knowledge available at the time and with the resources already at hand. Conducting discussions in which faculty share aspirations, fears, successes, and failures is an example of facilitation at a group level. Organizing a goal-setting retreat for the entire college is an illustration of facilitation on the institutional level. Helping a teacher to interpret feedback from students and to plan for developing his or her competence would be facilitation at an individual level.

A second technique, often difficult to achieve but usually essential to significant improvement, to make structural or technical modifications in how things are done. Any action that alters the use of space or time falls into this category: e.g., the table of organization, job descriptions or relations between members of an organization, facilities, information flow, or decision-making patterns. An example of structural change on a personal level is to redefine a teacher's job to include more counseling and less administrative work. On an institutional level, calendar changes are structural modifications. Moving a department from one building to another is another example of altering the decision making procedure in a group.

A third technique is to provide new knowledge and expertise. An action which supplies information previously unavailable which, once provided, may improve or enhance a situation falls in this category. Providing individual faculty with fresh insights about instructional systems such as PSI is an example of a new knowledge intervention on the personal level. An illustration of this technique on an institutional level would be a consultant providing information to an institution about how to set up a competency-based curriculum. A group might have a workshop to learn transactional analysis techniques.

Finally, a truly creative faculty development strategy will include some research and development. An activity that emphasizes creating knowledge to improve teaching and learning or organizational procedures falls into this category. An illustration of this technique on a personal level is teaching an experimental course with a well designed evaluation of outcomes. On an institutional level, a college making a survey of its graduates, attempting to establish correlations with their undergraduate experiences, and making changes in teaching methods in accord with this analysis is

using research as a change technique. An experimental "inner college" to demonstrate certain methods in educational philosophies would fall in this category.

Levels of Entry

The levels at which these techniques can be introduced have already been indicated.

We are obviously functioning on a personal level when we undertake directly to help an individual improve his or her professional effectiveness, e.g., when a colleague asks us to observe his classroom presentation and to provide a critique.

Much professional activity, however, is performed not by individuals but by groups within an institution. Committees and departments function as entities within themselves, and their effectiveness depends on the professional and interpersonal competence of their members. An activity intended to improve the competence of a group is multipersonal, such as helping a department to make decisions more effectively, or training a committee in group problem solving skills.

Finally, of course, we may attempt to improve the effectiveness of a college as a whole by altering decision-making procedures, organizational structures, intergroup relationships, the assignment of resources, or by clarifying objectives, improving planning and so on. Here we function at the institutional level.

These four techniques and three levels provide the matrix which will be used hereafter in discussing the strategies chosen by the four colleges.

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Techniques

Levels	1 Process/ Facilitation	2 Structural/ Technical	3 Knowledge/ Expertise	4 Demonstration/ Research/and Development
a) Personal	1a	2a	3a	4a
b) Multi- personal	1b	2b	3b	4b
c) Institu- tional	1c	2c	3c	4c

Although this matrix helps to distinguish activities useful in faculty development, it does not isolate them. Quite to the contrary, activities bear upon and influence each other, and an effective strategy for faculty development must recognize and use these relationships. Research and development, for example, can produce knowledge and expertise which leads to structural changes which in turn can make a person or department significantly more effective. On the other hand, institutional changes in policy can directly affect the work performed by individual.

Often activities could be assigned to more than one of the categories depending on what is emphasized. The pattern can be complex and is imprecise, but this does not vitiate the usefulness of the matrix in understanding the strategies followed by the four colleges, or its utility as a planning aid for those involved in institutional change. The matrix is useful in developing awareness of the range of potential activities which can influence organizational life. The model also provides a useful

analytical tool for looking at change programs that are underway or in planning. It is a helpful device for thinking about how one is intervening or might intervene in an organization, and the authors found the categories useful in organizing the information which was collected.

Process Facilitation -- Personal

Like most colleges and universities in the United States, all four colleges in this study had been giving at least minimal support to individual faculty before the CASC program. Just how much support they gave and how imaginative it was varied considerably from college to college -- as did the degree to which the colleges supplemented or improved on their traditional practices after the CASC program.

College A, for example, had been making available to faculty $200 in travel money for each person and $50 for professional memberships. Support in such amounts proved to be of considerable importance to faculty, many of whom spoke enthusiastically of the ways they used these funds and what they were able to accomplish. It was clear from the implications of the discussion that College A has not just been improving faculty with these grants; the effect also has been to increase the faculty's positive feelings about the college.

Colleges B and D have provided similar grants but the amounts were so low that faculty considered them an insignificant factor in their professional development. College C has recently developed a policy of providing up to $200 for faculty to develop new courses or for any purpose clearly promoting professional growth. These funds are in addition to travel grants available to full time faculty for professional meetings. College C asks for a complete prospectus from faculty and expects

accountability . A good many faculty do not actually apply for the full amount, apparently providing a good deal at self-discipline. The prospectus and accountability are not inhibiting factors; faculty simply ask for support when they need it. These grants are tied in with a two week period in the spring which the faculty must devote to developmental activity.

College B turned its skill in grantsmanship to the benefit of individual faculty. The director of faculty development keeps faculty aware of grants available outside the college and encourages people to apply. Faculty appreciate this service, and it tempers the criticism that faculty development at this college is a one person show. It should be added that the academic dean at College A also circulated such information, but received less positive reactions from faculty. It may be that such suggestions are more favorably viewed when they come from colleagues rather than administrators.

In varying degrees, all four colleges have approved leaves of absence. Because resources are limited, such leaves are usually without pay, although two colleges have typical sabbatical leave programs. College C is generous with leaves for faculty who find outside opportunities, and College D has been helpful in setting up opportunities for faculty to finish advanced degree programs.

As a result of the CASC program, two of the colleges have taken steps to help faculty to diagnose their own teaching. College C initiated procedures whereby anyone who wished could have a TV tape made of his teaching. The faculty member may then review the tape, view it with a team of colleagues, or ask for a critique from the director of the taping program. Most participants chose the latter alternative. The program was used by about 24 faculty, then the director was given a leave. Though he was

still spending one day a week on the campus, he was no longer easily available and had not trained anyone else to carry on the program. College D has also taken steps to encourage faculty to make video tapes of classes and to study them, but achieved less participation. The School of Nursing at College D has used video taping to improve teaching, and as a service to the college, it set up process seminars in which faculty could learn how to make video tapes of classes and how to diagnose them. Attendance at the seminars was fair but the college took no steps to follow up the seminars with an institution-sponsored taping program. At the time of the authors' visit, no member of the faculty (outside of Nursing) has used video taping to improve teaching.

Finally, College A undertook to provide diagnosis of teaching through the use of mutually supportive teams. Entirely consistent with the college's philosophy, pairs of colleagues were asked to visit each other's classes, to provide a critique, to set objectives and to plan strategies for improvement. At the time the college was visited, only about six pairs had actually begun the process and none were moving with much vigor.

These pairs of mutually supportive colleagues were part of a strategy of personal growth contracts adopted by College A. Indeed, they have been the major focus of the Professional Growth Committee. The team at the CASC Summer workshop in Oklahoma had learned about growth contracts and, upon returning to the campus, presented the idea to the faculty at large. In November, another team of the faculty attended a workshop sponsored by the Danforth Foundation and returned with further refined plans for instituting growth contracts. Characteristically, College A chose to call these growth <u>plans</u> to avoid the legalistic ring of <u>contracts</u>. The Danforth group presented its proposal to the Professional Growth Committee, and some of the Danforth group then comprised a subcommittee to refine the concept.

They defined growth plans as the identification by individual faculty of their particular strengths and weaknesses, the selection of goals for improvement, and the steps to be taken in achieving these goals. In April it was proposed to faculty that drawing up growth plans would be considered normative, though not actually required. Each faculty member was to select three colleagues with whom to work in devising his or her plan -- these colleagues would periodically review progress of the plan. The faculty voted in favor of the proposition.

The faculty were, apparently, under no pressure to approve the proposal. They voted for it because they thought it was a good idea and they indicated to interviewers that they continue to support the concept. But the fact remains that very few persons have carried out the program. The reasons for this failure were not clear, but a large part of the problem seems to have been the assumption that interest alone was sufficient to generate behavioral change. There was no specific guidance in drawing up growth plans. No deadlines were set for the basic steps in the strategy. No training or team building activities were provided. The Professional Growth Committee did not feel that it should put itself in charge of the process, and a vague apprehension as to possible institutional abuse of evaluation of progress toward self-determined goals made it unwise to place an administrator in charge. As a result, there was no one to whom people were answerable. A few faculty expressed an uneasy feeling that the Professional Growth Committee was pushing growth plans on the faculty. This may be a rationalization which has naturally developed because so little has been accomplished. The primary inhibiting factors seem to be the lack of guidance, deadlines, and accountability and presenting the idea for approval so late in the academic year seems to have been a strategic mistake.

The evidence indicates that personal growth contracts (plans) are likely to be successful only when the institutional expectation is expressed not just as stated policy but in the assignment of money and time for its achievement. College D, for example, used workshops to present growth contracting to its faculty, but no faculty member had made a contract at the time of the visit. College C, on the other hand, changed its calendar, adding two weeks, so that faculty can concentrate on personal development. Faculty members are expected to develop a project (a mini-growth contract) for the two weeks, to submit it to the dean's office, and to request funds necessary to carry it out. Faculty think of the two weeks as a welcome opportunity and speak with pride of what they accomplished last year and with anticipation of their plans for the year ahead.

The greater success in personal planning experienced by College C may have been due to the fact that faculty were asked to set discrete objectives that could be accomplished in about two weeks, rather than thinking in long term objectives as did College A and D. If so, the implication is that long term plans will be more successful when broken down into separate, easily manageable steps. Also, College A set up personal growth plans as an additional responsibility on top of all the other tasks faculty are expected to perform, while College C assigned a specific piece of the calendar to personal development, freed faculty from all other obligations during that time, paid them and assumed it was their professional responsibility to make the most of it. Faculty were asked for prospectuses and reports, and the college provided limited but significant financial support. In these ways, the institution encouraged and supported meeting its expectations about individual planning and growth.

Process Facilitation -- Multipersonal

All four colleges had taken steps to strengthen some groups within the institution. College A, for example, makes available to each department $100 per year for retreats, meals, or other activities that will give the members of the department an opportunity to gather and to talk about their common concerns. This college also holds a week long retreat for the entire faculty before the academic year begins. There seems to be no doubt that these are important in the life of the community and have much to do with the sense of unity and shared purpose that characterize the college. College B holds lunch gatherings for groups of faculty interested in an announced subject or in listening to a particular speaker. College B also has well attended TGIF (Thank God, it's Friday) gatherings in the faculty development lounge for which the faculty development team provides refreshments.

College C has changed the place of its faculty meetings from a stuffy windowless classroom -- a place which seemed to encourage tension and frustration -- to a spacious room with windows and a fireplace. All meetings are now preceded with a faculty coffee, managed by the Growth and Development Committee, and the improvement in tone of the meetings is reported to be little short of miraculous. Faculty at College C also join in group devotions. The college encourages spouses to share in the professional lives of faculty. Aided by a baby sitting service recently established, the college invites spouses to workshops, gives them free tuition for courses, invites them to faculty gatherings, and assumes they are part of the community. Faculty speak with appreciation of this, and at College C there seemed to be little of the too common tension between family and professional responsibilities.

College D, on the other hand, uses few such techniques to bring people together. It did hold an all-college workshop, and the almost universal appreciation for that workshop ("It gave us a change to talk to people for the first time.") is testimony to the need. But because there are few such activities and because many faculty at College D commute, groups tend to be strongly aligned according to their professional interests. The School of Nursing, the Education Program, the Division of Sciences, and so on, are strong, self-motivated entities inclined to make decisions in the light of their own needs with little regard for the requirement of other elements in the College. College D, in short, needs activities designed to strengthen relationships among its members.

Process Facilitation -- Institutional

All four colleges have manifested, in one way or another, a desire for more effective means of institutional communication, decision-making, and action. College C, as a key step in its program for the implementation of change, has been through a goal setting phase, and College B has engaged in a lengthy self-study, held an off-campus retreat, and is participating in an elaborate long range planning project. In spite of these activities, there does not seem to be much institutional control of goals. Neither of these institutions has substantially altered its objectives, although both articulated goals to which they were already committed and established some priorities among them. The other two colleges seem to feel that the goals are understood in the community and need no articulation beyond what is said in the catalogue.

These colleges managed to move toward making committee processes more effective or, at least, more reflective of current institutional values

and attitudes. College C initiated a 'trial ballon' or contingency model of decision-making. Under this plan, a decision is made, publicized by the appropriate committee, and put into effect at once unless there are a number of requests that it be considered further. If significant questioning arises, further hearings are conducted. Faculty like the system; they say it saves faculty meeting time for more important things than pro forma approvals of committee actions. This revision was conceived by the Growth and Development Committee and was readily accepted by faculty at large. The faculty felt however, that an earlier proposal for decision-making by ad hoc groups and elimination at standing committees was too extreme. Though all of the colleges are dissatisfied with traditional faculty meetings, none have done so well in resolving the problem as College C. As has been noted, College C shifted the time of the meetings from a constricted morning hour to an open ended afternoon hour and planned time for coffee before the meeting began. This college holds a meeting each week; but only one meeting a month is devoted to business of the other meetings. One is planned by the academic dean and is usually informative, and one is planned by the Growth and Development Committee. The fourth weekly period is reserved for committee work.

College D changed the time of its meetings to give opportunity for more of its part-time and off-campus faculty to attend, and it conducts the meetings partly in camera and partly in discussion sections or buzz groups. College A, like College C, schedules weekly meetings, one of which is a faith and learning presentation planned by the dean. This meeting provides some opportunity for exchanges among faculty, but the others are dominated by the administration, at least as seen by faculty who describe them as uninteresting and unproductive.

Structural Technical -- Personal

The four colleges have made only limited alterations in the structural patterns within which individuals function as faculty members. The patterns of leaves and personal development grants have been inherited from the past, with the exception of College C's support for projects during the two weeks set aside for personal development. Two colleges did undertake to define more precisely what individual faculty member's needs are. Members of the Faculty Development Committee at College D undertook to interview all faculty about their needs and interests, and the team at College A conducted a survey to find out what individual faculty are doing. Structural-technical changes, even when focused on the development of individuals, usually require the participation of deans and presidents, which was designed to be at a relatively low level in this project.

Administrative support, for example, was essential for College C to institute two weeks per year of contracted faculty time for personal development. The Strategies Committee (with a membership of faculty and administrators) reviews the proposals, approves the plans, and recommends the financial support. And at College A, the practice of contracting for nine months while requiring only eight months of teaching is supported by the administration. Two weeks of the remaining month are committed -- one week at a preschool retreat in the Fall, and one week to a mini-term optional for students but not for faculty. The other two weeks of the 'extra' month are to be used at faculty discretion for some developmental purpose.

Administrative support has likewise been necessary in setting aside space for faculty reading rooms at College C and D, and for the well-furnished

space provided at College B -- couches, easy chairs, low tables, a shelf of books on faculty development and even a refrigerator comprise the decor. This room is also priority space, away from the main administration offices, but at the crossroads of faculty activity. At the time of the visit, faculty drifted in and out, relaxed on the couches, and chatted, without much concern for a man from maintenance who was installing some very tasteful hanging lamps. The room is adjacent to the office of the Director of Faculty Development, and in fact is part of it, separated only by a translucent fiberglass partition. Having the office so much a part of the lounge is the only disadvantage of an enviable facility. This space use reinforces the image that faculty development at College B is very closely tied to the person whose office adjoins the lounge.

Structural Technical -- Interpersonal

The most basic of the interpersonal structural activities at the four colleges was, of course, the formation of the faculty development teams themselves. The history and structure of each team have been outlined in the Chapter on The Four Colleges.

Other interpersonal structures set up to facilitate faculty development include the TV taping service established by College C, the teams of two organized at College A for mutual consultation and observation of classes, and the small faculty groups established by the same college to assist members in growth planning and implementation of plans. In this category, too, are alternative structures tried by Colleges B and C in their efforts to make faculty meetings more satisfactory.

Structural Technical -- Institutional

Structural-technical changes, particularly when they involve the entire institution, require participation from the administration. The CASC program was conceived to be faculty focused and faculty implemented, and no institution-wide structural-technical changes have evolved directly from the faculty development teams. Some changes have occurred, however, and though they are not directly caused by faculty development teams, they have a good deal to do with the environment in which the teams work. The assignment of two weeks for personal projects as a part of the calendar change at College C was obviously highly supportive to the objectives of the CASC program. College B, in raising support for community development, found money and released time for faculty development.

On the other hand, the administration at College A has made a study of curriculum efficiency and applied the results in planning, which have probably been inhibiting to faculty development, at least in the short run, because the general faculty attitude toward this study was one of reserve, perhaps suspicion. Although no one denied such studies are necessary, some questioned the way in which the data were accumulated and some faculty were skeptical about the use to be made of them. The same apprehension seems to have carried over and colored attitude toward the personal development contracts which College A instituted on paper, but was slow to carry out. College D, meantime, provides an example of the problems of partial revision. Its impressive School of Nursing revised its own offerings, requirements, and class schedule, and there is no doubt that the changes have strengthened the program. Many of the courses the students take, however, are taught elsewhere in the college. Several faculty outside of nursing felt that the actions taken by the School of Nursing

had been unilateral and had caused problems in other institutional departments by failing to take their concerns sufficiently into account. It has already been pointed out that College D lacks a sense of unity. Partial structural revision is likely to develop in such an institutional environment and may, in turn, contribute to increasing differentiation.

Knowledge and Expertise -- Personal

All four colleges have taken steps to make knowledge and expertise available to faculty members. All had used the Exxon Foundation faculty development tapes (provided by CASC) with varying degrees of effectiveness. At College C, the tapes were on prominent display in the faculty development lounge, along with reading materials which were frequently added to and changed, and a cassette player was available in the same room. The room itself is in the center of activity in the campus social center. As a result, the Exxon tapes had been used more often here than at any other college. Even here, however, the use tapered off fairly rapidly. An inspection of the sign-out slips indicated that the first tapes had been tried by a good many faculty, and that the number of users decreased steadily as one went through the series. College D set up discussion opportunities to share responses to these tapes. The discussions were sparsely attended, although those who attended reported them to be useful and interesting. Except at College C, use of the tapes was discouraged by lack of accessibility and absence of an inviting space in which to listen to them.

All four colleges made information available to faculty, but the styles of doing so -- and the effectiveness -- varied considerably. At College A the academic dean used faculty meetings to keep people informed.

This is appropriate, since the dean is a knowledgeable man, but dissemination is probably less effective than if the information had come from the faculty themselves. At College B much of the information came directly from the chairperson of the faculty development team, who was also director of faculty development. Most of the information was specific, frequently about grant opportunities or other options for professional development, often highly pertinent to the interests of individual faculty. Not all information at College B came from the director of faculty development, however. The committee initiated wine and cheese gatherings in various departments at which some member of the faculty with information to share or an idea to explore would briefly speak. The committee also circulated important information by memorandum. In spite of the availability of an attractive lounge assigned to faculty development at College B, there appeared to be little general reading by faculty in teaching theory and techniques. College C used its lounge as an information center and reading room. Its light and airy atmosphere was attractive, and by frequently changing the available material, the committee assured that anyone stopping was likely to find something new and interesting to read. At College D, without such a lounge and with its dean deliberately avoiding direct involvement in the program, the committee used seminars to instruct faculty in making TV tapes of classes and to discuss materials of common interest such as the Exxon tapes. In a college where many faculty are part-time and where attending a seminar is likely to mean an awkward change in the faculty schedule, these procedures are likely to have limited success.

Knowledge and Expertise -- Multipersonal

In one way or another, all four colleges are bringing in outside knowledge and expertise to help with faculty development. College A invited a nationally known consultant to speak on adult development. His visit was an important element in the willingness of faculty to undertake growth planning. College B has used an outside consultant to present a number of non-traditional teaching methods at a one-day workshop for all faculty. The entire purpose of the statewide program of faculty development in which this school had earlier participated was to put faculty in tough with knowledge and expertise beyond their own campuses. College C, through use of consultants, brought to its faculty expertise on planning for change for three years before the CASC program was implemented. And all colleges, of course, were using the knowledge and experience of consultants made available by CASC at the August workshop in Oklahoma, at the regional workshops, and during follow-up consulting visits on individual campuses.

College D's January workshop on teaching and learning was indicative of how much difference new knowledge can make. The workshop was clearly a red-letter event, since a large number of faculty commented on how exciting and worthwhile it had been. It was designed to encourage faculty from different academic areas to get acquainted with each other, to learn what was going on outside one's own department, and to expose faculty to new ideas about teaching and learning. The new concepts presented in ways that were acceptable to the faculty were intriguing, and enabled participants to recognize the competency of colleagues who were teaching in different ways. Since there have been serious tensions between divisions in this college, the chance for faculty to mingle in a satisfying

way was particularly valuable. One department started using TV in a way that had been demonstrated in the workshop, and a group of faculty held a seminar for other faculty to demonstrate ways to use TV equipment. A professor from the Department of Education, as a consequence of the workshop, worked on teaching methods with the School of Nursing. And, following the model of the workshop, one faculty meeting was designed to use small group discussions, which was unlike the usual meeting style. Finally, the concept of growth contracts was reinforced. At the time of the visit, several faculty were writing contracts, and the committee was planning to call for all faculty to develop contracts during the year 1975-76.

Knowledge and Expertise -- Institutional

Keeping up-to-date with knowledge and expertise pertinent to a college is usually a responsibility of presidents and deans rather than faculty committees. The faculty development teams, when they did initiate new techniques and know-how, were usually focusing on teaching or the professional roles of faculty. Nevertheless, the degree to which administrations were in touch with the state of the art beyond their own campuses had much to do with the effectiveness of the team's work.

College C used the best, up-to-date expertise in planning for growth and change, and it created an environment stimulating to faculty development. The stimulation was probably not simply causative, though calendar changes resulting from the planning offered new opportunities for personal growth. In addition, the willingness to look at new developments in planning for change set an example for faculty development programming. Planning for change was based on the assumption, which seems to have been contagious,

that a college can control its development. In any event, no one at College C questioned that the college could change, and the only discussion was over the direction of change and the pace.

College A, in contrast, may have created an atmosphere partially inimical to faculty development by the way in which it applied up-to-date expertise to the study of faculty work loads and curriculum efficiency. An expert was brought in to do an analysis. He built little relationship with the faculty and although they thought he had some good ideas, they did not trust him much. The study made the faculty uneasy because they did not feel sufficiently involved in it. They also questioned the accuracy of some of the data. But the roots of the problem may run deeper; faculty were not entirely sure what the objectives of the study were or how the findings were to be used. The consultant was more visible to the administration, or at least to the dean, than to the faculty, which increased the faculty's suspicions.

There may be something to be learned in this contrast between the two colleges. The use of outside expertise by administrators may be threatening if faculty do not have a clear idea of how it is to be used, or if they do not have enough contact with the outside consultants to have confidence in them. If these dangers are avoided, the use of know-how from beyond the boundaries of the local campus is likely to be supported by faculty.

Research and Demonstration -- Personal

At College D the team gave priority to demonstrating new teaching techniques. There, one division experimented with TV taping of class sessions and then conducted a seminar so that other faculty could learn

the techniques. In all four colleges, individual faculty have been exploring new teaching techniques because these are primarily teaching colleges. However, there has not been much carefully formulated research on teaching and learning. Research in colleges like these often takes the form of trying something and then informally evaluating the results. Sometimes the experiments are worthy of attention beyond the local campus. One faculty member at College A developed a system of programmed slides and tapes which appealed to students and taught very effectively certain kinds of material. Other faculty knew of his system, were proud of it, and some of them were using it for their own teaching. The team devoted considerable attention to extending the use of this method and to exploring other "package teaching" methods.

Research and Demonstration -- Interpersonal

College B sponsored wine and cheese parties at which innovative faculty could tell others about their experiments. This was an ideal setting for an activity which in more formal circumstances could be threatening. College D held a seminar in TV taping in the hope of getting others to follow the lead of the particular division which had been using the technique to analyze teaching styles. The results were disappointing in terms of the number of participants, although those who attended profited from the experience. The implications are that such demonstrations need to be tailored to the needs of the group and that one should not expect a large percentage of faculty to adopt any one idea, at least very quickly.

Research and Demonstration -- Institutional

All four colleges were doing institutional research in varying degrees, not all of it immediately pertinent to faculty development but potentially useful for that purpose. Such data as alumni occupations, attrition rates, student aptitude scores, library use, and class sizes are typical of research on an institutional level in these schools. Every college gathers similar kinds of data, either for its own use or to respond to requests from accrediting agencies, foundations, and government agencies. Unfortunately, this research is seldom action-oriented and does not often have much impact on program improvement. This was true of the four colleges in this study. Particularly lacking were local investigations of the effects of various teaching methods on learning. Also, faculty made little use of information developed in the many studies on such topics as teaching, learning and grading which have been conducted over the years. Indeed, many faculty are unaware that this body of literature exists, and others doubt its value.

Teams at Colleges A and D conducted surveys of faculty needs, interests, and resources. Such studies run the danger of delaying activities until they are completed, but they can be helpful in establishing priorities and in giving faculty a sense of being influential in design of the program. It is essential for the team to respond quickly to the information gathered.

HINDRANCES AND ASSETS

In the institutions visited, there were factors which inhibited the launching of an effective set of activities to promote faculty development; other factors encouraged and nurtured such activities. In this section we will discuss the elements which were the blocks to the initiation of such programs. In the next section we will look at those which were supportive.

Hindrances to Team Progress

Implementation of a faculty development program does not require a high level of technical expertise. There are skills and information which are useful and important, but for the most part, they are not highly complex. Most approaches to improvement of instruction, organizational development, and personal growth do not require extensive technology. The crucial factor in the success of these activities is the degree to which the persons in the institution are committed to them. As in a marriage, the technical adequacy is much less important than the desire to succeed. One of the assumptions underlying the CASC strategy of having faculty teams as the mainsprings of the effort was that a sense of ownership by the faculty would enhance the effort. This sense of ownership would, in turn, increase the amount of energy faculty would invest in the activities. To a considerable degree, that assumption proved to be correct. It seems clear that resistance and suspicion were reduced once faculty felt the program was in the charge of their colleagues.

On the other hand, in one of the colleges studied, the administration failed to give sufficient signs of support to the faculty development effort to assure people that much backing truly existed. The president had

little knowledge of what the team was doing and had almost no interaction with the team. This lack of involvement contributed to the suspicion of the administration by the faculty which was widespread on this campus and which deflected much energy from flowing into the change projects. It is important for deans and presidents to provide money, recognition to team members, ideas about possible activities, and to support the ventures which are designed. Generating ownership among faculty is not the same as laissez faire leadership.

There were problems in the implementation of plans devised by the committees. At College A, for instance, there existed some feeling that the move toward growth plans was being pushed by the committee and was not a response to an expressed need of the faculty. There was also suspicion about what the administration intended to do with the results. A more important block, however, was that the faculty voted to adopt the growth plan approach a month before the end of the school year. This did not permit time to get anything accomplished that year, and, it necessitated restarting that program the following year. Another hindrance to implementing this plan was the lack of motivation and follow-through by the champions of that cause. In sum, there was not enough strategic thinking to move from the stage of a good idea to the stage of having specific actions sequenced to achieve this goal. Concrete steps, participants, and completion dates were not publicly explicated. A failure to do this kind of specific planning and the assumption that statements of interest intent, and good will are sufficient to generate action seem to be common errors.

A general category of problems is divisiveness or factionalism in the institution. This appeared in several forms. In College C there was concern over a lack of communication between faculty and the

administration which consumed time and energy that could have been used more creatively. By skillfully managing its relationship, the team avoided being trapped in the middle of this tension. At College B there was division among faculty and between some faculty and the president about whether programs to serve new student populations in non-traditional ways was a good idea. A third example of divisiveness was observed at College D; a personal conflict between two high-status faculty who were members of the team immobilized the group.

Lack of clarity or agreement about the purposes of the institution seemed to be a problem at two of these colleges. It is difficult to convince faculty to commit substantial effort to change without a good sense of the framework within which the innovation is to occur.

The lack of communication between the team and other groups in the college was a serious handicap where it occurred. In College C everyone we talked to knew who the members of the team were, knew what the group had done and what its plans were. There was a sense of the team being open, accessible, and public. That feeling clearly increased the readiness of faculty to support or to become involved in the team's activities. In College D, on the other hand, few faculty had that kind of knowledge about the team. In College B, the team and the project were viewed as the responsibility of the chairperson. This posed problems in terms of reducing the sense of participation and ownership of some team members and other faculty. However, the team made extensive efforts through a newsletter, reports, and meetings to keep the college community informed. This effort was mentioned frequently as an aid in gaining credibility and support for the faculty development project.

Another hindrance to the implementation of a faculty development program is the failure to provide settings in which the faculty can regularly talk, in a supportive environment, about professional concerns. Faculty meetings frequently are not designed to provide opportunities for this kind of interchange, and there are not other planned occasions which fill this need. At each college, faculty reported that it was unusual to discuss with colleagues such things as teaching styles, alternative assumptions about learning, or the consequences of evaluation methods. Further, there are typically no adequate feedback systems to help faculty members judge how they are doing.

Inefficient, frustrating decision-making processes constituted another impediment to the launching of the programs. Committees often overlap, have no clear mandate, do not fill a real need, and do not attend to the developmental needs of their members. In one institution faculty reported that decision-making was virtually ham-strung by three or four members who dominated faculty meetings through parliamentary procedures. This was experienced by most faculty as debilitating and infuriating.

Clearly, lack of money both for program development and faculty salaries is an important impediment. All but one of these colleges have low salaries, the top faculty salary typically being under $14,000. Faculty are under great pressure to survive, and they must cope with serious financial problems. One outcome of this pressure is that many faculty moonlight on other jobs. There is also a shortage of funds for developmental activities such as retreats, leaves, materials, consultants, equipment, or trips. The importance of this issue is highlighted by the favorable impact of small amounts of money when they were available for such purposes.

Another category of hindrances to the functioning of the teams was the failure to deal with the irrational aspects of organization and

group life. Change is threatening to most of us; it can stimulate anxieties which may be expressed in a variety of overt and subtle ways. Opportunities need to be created so that individuals can deal with these anxieties in a constructive manner. Differences in preferences about the pace and the amount of change and suspicion about the team's actual purpose were common on these campuses. The norm of non-confrontation which existed at three of the colleges made dealing constructively with these divisions difficult. Faculty also typically reported that they did not have support groups in which they could explore their feelings and ideas in an open manner.

Finally, a critical problem is the lack of time for the team to work. Faculty at these colleges are burdened by heavy teaching, advising, and institutional responsibilities. In order to devote the amount of time necessary to get an effective faculty development program initiated, team members must have time to work; they should also receive training in group process so time will be well spent.

Factors Conducive to Success

No definitive conclusions can be drawn as to what conditions encourage faculty development on the basis of the investigation of four colleges. Four colleges do not make a significant sample, and there are more than enough variables to keep any conclusions modest and tentative. However, the four colleges did seem to demonstrate certain patterns which also have been observed in other institutions. While we cannot provide fully developed theories, we can suggest some useful rule-of-thumb guides in planning.

Many of the factors contributing to strong faculty development programs are not merely reciprocals of the inhibiting factors outlined

in the previous section. They are added elements that seem to be useful in the mix, rather like catalysts in a chemical reaction. Further, although some of these elements seem obvious, analysis indicates that they are not necessarily simple -- they must be understood if they are to be effectively used.

It is obvious, for example, that faculty development programming must grow out of faculty action. Administrators can decree changes in parking areas, or deans can change schedules, and faculty generally will comply. But changes that require commitment and acceptance if they are to work cannot be dictated; much of the commitment is generated from faculty involvement in the creation and implementation of their development program.

"Faculty action," however, means different things on different campuses (it means different things on the same campus, depending on what action we are talking about). For example, a faculty committee can study problems of concern to the faculty at large and recommend solutions. We usually think of all committees as operating in this way, but they do not. Faculty are particularly careful to see that most committees are "representative" of the diverse points of view on campus. In spite of the care taken to make committees representative, committee recommendations are often re-worked during faculty meetings. Other kinds of committees perform the less obvious function of being instruments by which a faculty maintains the fiction of responsibility but avoids involvement in matters about which it is not really concerned.

In short, a committee is sometimes a group to which we assign the responsibility of thinking about something we would rather not think about ourselves. Since the committee represents the faculty, the faculty can comfort itself with the thought that "we are working on the problem," and turn to other matters. Unfortunately, the faculty frequently

seems compelled to rehash the committee's work in various, often unproductive, ways. Just because committees are ostensibly instruments for action, to delegate something to a committee can become an almost irresistibly tempting avoidance device. Usually committee members take their job seriously, but they are hindered by the apathy of others, by lack of skill in group processes, and they are beset with a myriad of other problems. A serious hindrance is the common lack of clarity about the decision-making role of the committee -- that is, whether it is to decide, to advise, to generate ideas, to advocate, or to share information.

The most effective faculty development teams in these four colleges were powerful instruments of change, and it is interesting to ask why few committees or teams achieve this goal. The most effective teams were truly representative of different points of view -- including some people who were initially apprehensive about faculty development. To comprise a committee of volunteers seems to promise unity and commitment, but it may be ineffective. It disregards the old truism that there is no believer like a convert, and that the way to persuade people is to get them involved in working on a problem. And, an effective institutional change strategy is to gain support of opinion leaders which requires some recruiting. The most effective teams were not comprised of members who were all initially interested in faculty development. These teams were comprised of people with high energy levels and with reputations for integrity -- often the kind of people others may disagree with but respect. But the most critical difference between these groups and many committees is that they had help in working through differences between members and in developing group skills. All of the teams reported that the workshops and consulting were of great value.

The most effective teams were constantly visible. A committee becomes an avoidance device only if it permits itself to retire from public view, puts together a questionnaire, formulates a study, and promises a report "by the middle of February." The effective teams did not wait to report to their colleagues as one item on the agenda of a crowded faculty business meeting. They involved others from the beginning, and though they did not think of it in such Madison Avenue terms, they kept themsleves visible. They sponsored coffees, worship services, workshops, retreats, and campus visits by outside resource persons. They were responsible for changes which could not escape attention, such as a change in the time of faculty meetings; and for services attractive to many, like providing sitters when there were to be college occasions for both faculty and spouses. Two of the teams managed to get assigned to them one of the weekly faculty meetings each month.

Similarly, although the support of administration is obviously essential, such support was expressed in very different ways on the four campuses, with significantly different degrees of effectiveness. Even more interesting, one of the teams which accomplished the most, did so in an environment characterized by a sense of isolation from the president and the dean. However, that administration provided two very tangible symbols of support which were the kind of symbols that help but do not interfere, that encourage but leave decisions to the faculty. That administration had provided attractive faculty space close to the center of traffic patterns. The space was useful, but beyond that it gave to faculty development an identity and, because it was desirable, it gave status. This administration had also assigned two weeks out of the contract year to personal development projects. It was expressing priorities by assigning both space and time. The assignment was a more

effective statement of support than any verbalization could have been, and perhaps more effective than money.

All four administrations were sincerely behind the faculty development efforts. No one questioned their sincerity, and faculty seemed to really believe the administration when it gave faculty development a place on the campus, and when it set aside time for personal development or for community activities. Any administrator who wants his or her faculty to believe he has changed his priorities may have to demonstrate seriousness by such assignments of space and time.

Further, faculty development progresses best in an environment with a history of active progress along other lines. If the faculty has already been engaged in revising curriculum or in planning for other changes, the efforts of the faculty development team are likely to be warmly welcomed. At first glance it would seem that these other activities have made people accustomed to change, but closer examination reveals that they need not have preceded the activities of the faculty development team. A lively urban renewal project may strengthen faculty development in spite of the fact that it is competing for faculty time and energy. A reasonable number of related activities going on at the same time can strengthen each other. There is no exact name for this melding phenomenon; the terms symbiosis and synergism capture part of the notion.

Synergism is probably the more appropriate term. Faculty development can be carried on side by side with a capital funds campaign in a symbiotic relationship; faculty development justifies the campaign and the campaign finances the development -- but this is not the kind of reinforcement we are talking about here. We are concerned instead with the supportive relationship between such activities as an urban renewal project and a faculty development program. Because they do not feed on each other in

an obvious way, it is not surprising that in the college where these activities function there should at first have been competition and friction. The surprising thing is that the two projects soon settled down to a synergistic relationship. Everyone was confident that the two projects "helped each other." No one was able to articulate why this should be so except that a network of people with overlapping interests and mutual supports was developed.

If they competed in some ways, both projects asserted a faith in the possibility of renewal. This belief was implicit in their goals. We may find, when we understand it better, that synergistic programs reinforce each other because each affirms the assumptions on which the others proceed. Whatever the reason for this phenomenon, one thing seems certain: no college should defer faculty development because it already has too many irons in the fire, although careful planning may be required to articulate faculty development with other activities.

It is also worth noting that those teams which accomplished the most did not operate in institutions marked by a constant sense of unity and good fellowship. These colleges tolerated differences of opinion even though they often led to conflict and tension. Conflict and tension, on the other hand, were chief factors inhibiting one of the teams which accomplished the least. Whether differences of opinion are creative or destructive seems to depend on the level of skill in managing conflict. For instance, if there are norms against harmful politics -- generally accepted rules for fair fighting -- differences seem to lead to growth. If there are not acceptable ways of dealing with tensions, they build and become corrosive. It seems to help to have: differences visible; positions clearly defined; acceptance of the opposition as worthy opponents rather

than enemies; direct dealing between adversaries; recognition of common values among people in various "camps"; and personnel available with conflict resolution skills. In any case, it is important to have well established mechanisms for resolving conflicts creatively (usually impossible in faculty meetings). All four colleges made an attempt to improve the quality of faculty meetings and to set up other mechanisms in which faculty can fruitfully encounter each other.

CONCLUSION

It may be helpful to conclude with a brief list of faculty development activities which proved or promised to be most effective in these four colleges. It is crucial, of course, that whatever is initiated be viewed by the faculty as an attempt to meet their needs on their campus. There is no such thing as a standard faculty development package.

Effective Activities Sponsored by Teams

Building a faculty lounge

Setting aside time on the calendar for faculty development activities

Television taping of teaching and discussion

Drawing up personal growth plans

Conducting open forums for faculty

Distributing information about grants and study opportunities

Conducting interviews or surveys to assess faculty needs, goals or problems, and using the data for program design

Helping to write proposals

Holding various kinds of workshops for faculty

Providing training for faculty development teams

Redesigning faculty meetings

Involving spouses in faculty workshops, forums, and worship services

Using consultants in a way that integrates their knowledge with the faculty's interests and needs

Providing babysitters for college events

Conducting retreats for the college community

In addition to these activities, there are those for which administrators have traditionally been responsible: mini-grants, leaves or sabbaticals, redefining roles, redistributing personnel evaluation, and retraining for new job requirements in the institutions. Some teams have been involved in helping to initiate or administer these activities as well as those listed previously. Ideally, faculty development is the joint responsibility of both faculty and administrators. The experience of these colleges clearly supports the conclusion that with adequate supports and training, teams of faculty can conduct well designed and useful programs.